

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/593,993

Applicant(s)

SHKEDI, ROY

Examiner

Jonathan Ouellette

Art Unit

3629

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Ouellette.(3) John Galbreath.(2) John Weiss (SPE).(4) Roy Shkedi.

Date of Interview: 20 January 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11-13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Katz (US 6,055,513).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant and attorney reviewed the basic concepts of the invention and outlined the similarities and differences with the prior art of Katz. Mr. Galbreath proposed an amendment to the independent claims (1 and 11-13), which would integrate the "royalty payments" element described in the specification. Agreement was reached between Examiner Ouellette, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Galbreath, and Mr. Shkedi that the prior art of Katz did not contain a royalty payment element, and submitting the amendment would distinguish the instant invention from the cited prior art of Katz. Examiner Ouellette suggested filing an RCE, as the amendment would be after-final, and would necessitate an additional search.